

Hon. William Downing

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON  
IN AND FOR KING COUNTY

WILLIAM DUSSAULT as Guardian Ad  
Litem for S.P., a minor, EUGENE G.  
PATNODE and CLARISSA A. PATNODE,  
husband and wife,

Plaintiff,

v.

CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL AND REGIONAL  
MEDICAL CENTER, a non-profit  
organization, licensed in Washington state;  
SELLEN CONSTRUCTION CO., INC., a  
Washington corporation,

Defendant.

No. 05-2-36911-6 SEA

DEFENDANT CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL  
AND REGIONAL MEDICAL CENTER'S  
INTERROGATORIES PROPOUNDED TO  
CLARISSA A. PATNODE

AND SUPPLEMENTAL ANSWERS  
THERE TO

INTERROGATORY NO. 25: Describe in detail the facts upon which you rely to claim  
that the defendants were negligent, identifying each act or omission which you believe was  
wrongful and indicating what you believe should have been done under the circumstances that  
then existed.

## ANSWER:

The defendant should have provided a properly pressured health care facility, including  
Operating Room #15 ("OR #15"), in accordance with the Washington Administrative Code

CHPMC INTERROGATORIES TO CLARISSA PATNODE  
AND SUPPLEMENTAL ANSWERS THERETO - 1

LAYMAN, LAYMAN & ROBINSON, PLLC  
110 Occidental Ave. S., Suite 120  
Seattle, WA 98104  
(206) 340-1214 fax (206) 274-1790

1 when Plaintiff S.P. went in for her medical procedure. The defendant should have also provided  
2 a safe and clean health care facility, particularly OR #15, free of aspergillus spores in accordance  
3 with Children's Hospital and Regional Medical Center ("CHPMC") Infection Control Policies  
4 and Procedures Manual (2001) (hereinafter "CHPMC Manual"). Specifically, CHPMC's  
5 Manual provides the following:  
6

- 7 • in the HEPA filtered environment of the SCCA unit and in the Operating Room and  
8 Surgical Suite, it is expected that no Aspergillus spores will be collected.
- 9 • in other areas of the hospital, results will be compared with outside air aspergillus spore  
10 levels and will be expected to fall below that of the outside air during the same sample  
11 collection.

12 CHPMC/PATNODE00059. Unlike CHPMC's Manual indicating HEPA filters are utilized or to  
13 be employed in the Operating Room and Surgical Suite, CHPMC does not use HEPA filtration.  
14 See Answers to Interrogatory No. 32 and 35. Specifically, CHPMC's filters consist of 2 banks  
15 of filters and they typically are 2 inches thick with an efficiency rating of 30% and are backed up  
16 by a 95% high efficiency filter. *Id.* A HEPA or absolute filtration system has an efficiency  
17 rating greater or equal to 99.97% of particulates greater or equal to 0.3 microns in diameter and  
18 therefore filters aspergillus spores. Subsequently, CHPMC's filtration system does not filter  
19 aspergillus spores.  
20  
21

22 Joan Heath, Kathy Goodrich, Danielle Zerr, Steve Scheibe, Ruth Benefield, Treuman  
23 Katz, and Richard Molteni were negligent in allowing the CHPMC Manual to set forth  
24 inaccurate information particularly in light of the fact CHPMC's physicians and treating medical  
25 professionals relied on this information in providing medical care. CHPMC negligently adopted  
26 this Manual. Plaintiffs have attempted to schedule the depositions of Steve Scheibe, Ruth  
27 Benefield, Kathy Goodrich, and Richard Molteni, but CHPMC has not provided Plaintiffs with  
28 dates for these depositions. Plaintiffs anticipate that additional information as to CHPMC's  
29 negligence will be discovered during these depositions along with the discovery that CHPMC  
30 should be producing on May 4, 2007.  
31  
32  
33  
34

CHPMC INTERROGATORIES TO CLARISSA PATNODE  
AND SUPPLEMENTAL ANSWERS THERETO - 2

LAYMAN, LAYMAN & ROBINSON, PLLP  
314 Occidental Ave. S., Suite 500  
Seattle, WA 98104  
(206) 445-1314 fax (206) 252-1790

1        CHRMC's Manual cites important medical treatises to support the adoption of measures  
2 to protect the facility's environment, but many of CHRMC infection control practitioners did not  
3 read these materials. Had the CHRMC infection control practitioners taken the time to read  
4 these materials, they should have understood the difference between a HEPA filtration system  
5 and a high efficiency filtration system. If CHRMC's infection control professionals would have  
6 understood the type of filtration system in the Operating Rooms and Surgical Suite, it would  
7 have been evident and appropriate safety measures would have been put in place to ensure a  
8 patient's safety during a surgical procedure. As this did not occur, S.P. was not in a safe and  
9 clean environment during her surgical procedure and CHRMC infection control and engineering  
10 professionals breached this standard of care.

11        Further, evidence of CHRMC's negligence was its failure to act on information obtained  
12 through air sample testing, which revealed higher counts of aspergillus spores inside the facility  
13 than outside. As noted earlier, there should be lower levels of aspergillus spores outside the  
14 hospital than inside it. Prior to S.P.'s infection other patients acquired nosocomial aspergillus  
15 infections. CHRMC knew, or should have known, that it had a serious infection control problem  
16 within the hospital that placed patients in danger of being exposed to aspergillus spores. Despite  
17 these red flags, CHRMC infection control practitioners and the entire ICCC failed to adequately  
18 investigate and determine the source(s) of the aspergillus spores and infections. CHRMC's  
19 negligence was compounded by the utter failure of the infection control professionals to take  
20 "routine" air samples in the OR in accordance with CHRMC's Manual during the time period  
21 preceding S.P.'s infection. See CHRMC/PATNODE00058. Plaintiffs have obtained evidence  
22 from Neudorfer Engineers, CDi Engineers, Inc., and Sellen indicating critical care areas within  
23 CHRMC were negatively pressured prior to and after S.P. acquired the aspergillus infection.

24        CHRMC's infection control practitioners were also negligent in their failure to provide  
25 "safety education" for construction managers/workers in addition to technical and professional  
26 staff before or during projects in accordance with CHRMC's Manual. *Id.* CHRMC did not  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34

CHRMC INTERROGATORIES TO CLARISSA PATNODE  
AND SUPPLEMENTAL ANSWERS THERETO - 3

LAYMAN, LAYMAN & ROBINSON, PLLC  
316 Occidental Ave. S., Suite 500  
Seattle, WA 98104  
(206) 340-1314 fax (206) 292-1708

1 adequately determine safe routes for construction workers to follow within the facility and/or  
2 enforce worker restrictions into prohibited areas such as the hospital cafeteria.

3  
4 Other violations of CHRMC's Manual include but are not limited to the failure of  
5 Danielle Zerr, M.D., Chair of the ICCC, to make unscheduled inspections of construction sites.  
6 *Id.* In contravention of the Manual, Dr. Zerr had little to no oversight with the construction  
7 occurring at CHRMC. Although Joan Heath, as the Infection Control Manager, may have  
8 occasionally made unscheduled visits, construction enforcement and compliance with the  
9 CHRMC Manual was mainly left to Julie Smith. Ms. Smith lacked the experience, training and  
10 education to oversee this construction, particularly in light of the size and magnitude of the  
11 projects and the potential danger posed to patients in critical care areas. CHRMC elected not to  
12 employ an outside third-party with the expertise, knowledge and training to reasonably oversee  
13 the construction when it was presented with such an opportunity. CHRMC assumed all  
14 responsibility and risk when it made this decision.  
15  
16

17 Upon information and belief, CHRMC neither obtained a commissioning prior to  
18 beginning renovations, nor after renovations were completed in numerous areas of the hospital.  
19 In 1999 there appears to have been some commissioning completed in a very few areas, but it  
20 was not until approximately December of 2003 that CHRMC obtained a commissioning within  
21 the hospital for areas under construction such as the A and B Wings. This only occurred because  
22 it was determined that the hospital was negatively pressured. Phase III of the OR/PACU  
23 renovations started in approximately October of 2001 and were not completed until  
24 approximately May of 2002. Despite the impact of these renovations on CHRMC critical care  
25 systems, CHRMC did not obtain a commissioning. Thus, CHRMC did not know whether the  
26 HVAC system in the OR/PACU was operating as it was designed. If CHRMC would have  
27 completed a commissioning, as it should have, it would have discovered there was a problem  
28 with the HVAC systems in the OR and PACU. CHRMC infection control practitioners  
29 undertook the duty of infection control during construction. See CHRMC/PATNODE00079-  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34

CHRMC INTERROGATORIES TO CLARISSA PATNODE  
AND SUPPLEMENTAL ANSWERS THERETO - 4

LAYMAN, LAYMAN & ROBINSON, PLLP  
3100 Occidental Ave. S., Suite 800  
Seattle, WA 98104  
(206) 346-1314 fax (206) 229-1770

1 00084. As stated in CHRMC Manual, infection control should be "involved in planning for all  
2 phases of maintenance, construction and/or renovation projects, including the design phase...."  
3 *Id.* As CHRMC failed to request a commissioning in this area, it violated the Guidelines for  
4 Design and Construction of Hospital and Health Care Facilities. See AIA Guidelines for Design  
5 and Construction of Hospital and Health Care Facilities § 5.3 (2001). This is further evidence of  
6 CHRMC's negligence.  
7

8  
9 CHRMC's Manual expressly and unequivocally provides that "[t]he most common  
10 source of filamentous fungal infections in hospitals is thought to be through dissemination of  
11 fungal spores by ventilation systems." CHRMC/Patnode00057. CHRMC's Manual warns that  
12 the most immediate danger posed to patients during construction is a compromised HVAC  
13 system. However, CHRMC did nothing to protect the HVAC systems from increased exposure  
14 to dirt and airborne pathogens such as aspergillus during outside construction.  
15

16 The lack of communication, education and training by CHRMC's infection control  
17 practitioners and the ICCC to the Building and Engineering Department, and other staff was  
18 negligent. See e.g., CHRMC/PATNODE00043. For example, CHRMC's B&E should have  
19 received information about the "Hospital infection control program" from CHRMC's Manual  
20 plus annual education and training on infection control activities. The deposition testimony and  
21 interviews of fact witnesses clearly indicates this training was not done. Also, CHRMC's  
22 infection control practitioners did not make this Manual available to all hospital and contracted  
23 employees. CHRMC's Manual also states that "The Infection Control staff is responsible for  
24 developing the curriculum for nursing orientation and continuing education relating to  
25 surveillance, prevention, and control of infections." CHRMC/PATNODE00049. This also  
26 does not appear to have been done. Among CHRMC's employees there is a large minority  
27 population where English is a second language. CHRMC's infection control staff failed to verify  
28 whether all such employees understood the proper safety measures that they were being asked to  
29 complete as stated in the Manual. In general, CHRMC's B&E Departmental employees lacked  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34

1 the knowledge, education and to even be aware that the HVAC system was a common source of  
2 aspergillus infections in hospitals.

3  
4 Moreover, had the CHRMC infection control practitioners fully understood the danger  
5 posed to patients by a malfunctioning HVAC system, experts in the HVAC profession could  
6 have been employed to investigate and effectively mitigate the problem and properly train the  
7 Building and Engineering ("B&E") Department. CHRMC should have had manufacturer's  
8 representatives for its facility systems provide training to the B&E Department and record those  
9 training sessions for future use. CHRMC's B&E Department does not even have Owner's  
10 Manuals to consult so it can properly maintain its HVAC systems. Providing the B&E  
11 Department with proper materials and training would have ensured that the B&E Department  
12 knew how the systems were designed to work. It would have also ensured that these systems  
13 were properly maintained. This was not done.  
14

15  
16 Rather, CHRMC allowed Leonard Blumer, who is under-qualified, to have full control  
17 and responsibility for operating and maintaining these HVAC systems. CHRMC's infection  
18 control staff and the ICCC failed to verify whether he had the knowledge, skill and education to  
19 complete this task or that documentation was available to verify function of the HVAC systems.  
20 In fact, CHRMC's infection control provided no oversight for any services that Mr. Blumer  
21 rendered on the HVAC systems. Not only did Mr. Blumer fail to correct serious HVAC  
22 malfunctions with the sheaves, bearings, belts and damper actuators, it allowed Mr. Blumer to  
23 alter the air filters CHRMC purchased. Specifically, Mr. Blumer removed the gasketing on the  
24 air filters and replaced it with his "own method" of gasketing, which left an unsealed gap. This  
25 clearly compromised CHRMC's HVAC systems and created unnecessary and unreasonable  
26 hazards for patients receiving care within the hospital.  
27

28  
29 Knowing that CHRMC's B&E employees had not been properly trained in the area of  
30 infection control and in accordance with the Manual, CHRMC's infection control practitioners  
31 and the ICCC negligently relied on the B&E Department to ensure that the HVAC system  
32  
33  
34

CHRMC INTERROGATORIES TO CLARISSA PATNODE  
AND SUPPLEMENTAL ANSWERS THERETO - 6

LATMAN, LAYMAN & ROBINSON, PLLP  
230 Occidental Ave. S., Suite 570  
Seattle, WA 98104  
(206) 240-1214 fax (206) 252-1290

1 complied with, *inter alia*, the Washington Administrative Code. Moreover, CHRMC negligently  
2 relied on the B&E Department to determine that the HVAC systems functioned as it was  
3 designed. The B&E Department neither determined that the HVAC system met infection control  
4 standards nor that they functioned as they were designed. The evidence indicates no one at  
5 CHRMC assumed these duties. CHRMC's maintenance and care of its HVAC systems is  
6 completely reprehensible and patients such as S.P. were left to suffer the brunt of their  
7 negligence.  
8  
9

10 Plaintiffs also have evidence that CHRMC's B&E employees failed to maintain proper  
11 barrier protections when entering the ceiling. Had CHRMC's infection control practitioners  
12 engaged in proper education, training, enforcement and surveillance in accordance with the  
13 CHRMC Manual, these infection control problems would not have existed in this facility on a  
14 consistent basis.  
15

16 Upon information and belief, CHRMC's infection control practitioners violated  
17 Washington's reportable diseases regulations and its own Manual by failing to report a potential  
18 outbreak of aspergillus infections. See CHRMC/PATNODE00140-00144. Similarly, CHRMC's  
19 surveillance and investigation of aspergillus infections within the facility was below the standard  
20 of care. If CHRMC would have used reasonable efforts to conduct such activities problems with  
21 the HVAC systems, among other infection control problems, would have been discovered.  
22  
23

24 Plaintiffs have given CHRMC an extension on discovery that has been served on them  
25 and this response will be supplemented within a reasonable time when such discovery is  
26 received, and when CHRMC allows Plaintiffs to inspect CHRMC premises as set forth in  
27 Request for Inspection No. 1. Further, this answer will be supplemented when CHRMC allows  
28 Plaintiffs to take the depositions of CHRMC employees that it has requested and when Plaintiffs  
29 receive documents in accordance with pending *subpoena duces tecums*. This answer will also be  
30 supplemented with expert reports pursuant to the case scheduling order.  
31  
32  
33  
34

CHRMC INTERROGATORIES TO CLARISSA PATNODE  
AND SUPPLEMENTAL ANSWERS THERETO - 7

LAYMAN, LAYMAN & ROBINSON, PLLC  
315 Occidental Ave. S., Suite 300  
Seattle, WA 98104  
(206) 340-1314 fax (206) 292-1790

1  
2 **INTERROGATORY NO. 36:** Identify all fact witnesses and expert witnesses who will  
3 testify about the basis listed in interrogatory no. 35.  
4

5 **ANSWER:** Plaintiffs Gene and Clarissa Patnode and Plaintiff S.P. treating physicians at  
6 CHRMC. See their deposition transcripts. Plaintiffs' experts will be disclosed in accordance  
7 with the case schedule order.  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14

15 **ANSWERS TO INTERROGATORIES AND RESPONSES TO REQUESTS FOR**  
16 **PRODUCTION SUBMITTED** this 22<sup>nd</sup> day of April, 2007.  
17  
18

19 LAYMAN, LAYMAN, & ROBINSON, PLLP  
20

21  
22  
23 By 

24 John R. Layman, WSBA No. 13823

25 Andrew A. Schillinger, WSBA No. 34189

26 Attorneys for Plaintiffs  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34

CHRMC INTERROGATORIES TO CLARISSA PATNODE  
AND SUPPLEMENTAL ANSWERS THERETO - 11

LAYMAN, LAYMAN & ROBINSON, PLLP  
316 Occidental Ave. S., Suite 200  
Seattle, WA 98104  
(206) 340-1714 fax (206) 292-1790



## CHILDREN'S INFECTION CONTROL POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

## AIR SAMPLING

- results are communicated to stakeholders, including but not limited to Facilities management, contractors, unit managers, and hospital administration

### MANAGEMENT OF AIR SAMPLING RESULTS

Standards established at Children's Hospital for acceptable sample results from ambient air are as follows:

- in the HEPA filtered environment of the SCCA unit and in the Operating Room and Surgical Suite, it is expected that no *Aspergillus* spores will be collected
- in other areas of the hospital, results will be compared with outside air *Aspergillus* spore levels and will be expected to fall below that of the outside air during the same sample collection

### CONCERNING LEVELS

Depending on the location in the hospital where concerning levels are identified, infection control practitioners may:

- inspect the area where a concerning sample was obtained for issues such as:
  - air pressure gradient disturbances
  - disruption of construction barriers
  - leaking window or door seals
  - stained or water damaged ceiling tiles, flooring, or structural material
  - obvious mold or mildew growth
  - a need for environmental cleaning
- close an area to occupancy/use or delay opening an area after construction/renovation
- contact the Facilities manager, Building and Engineering director and/or construction contractor for remediation of construction barriers and air pressure gradients
- work with the unit or clinic nurse managers determine occupancy and use of a specific area while remediation occurs
- arrange for Environmental Services staff to provide thorough cleaning of a specific area
- re-sample the area after remediation activities have been completed before opening to unrestricted occupancy/use



ROG 4, 8, 10, 12 - 000022